Compare and Contrast Program Planning Models

Richard S. Baskas

Walden University

November 13, 2011

Abstract

This paper will examine the differences and similarities between two program planning models,

Tyler and Caffarella, to reveal their strengths and weaknesses. When adults are involved in

training sessions, there are various program planning models that can be used, depending on the

goal of the training session. Researchers developed these models based on their ideological

frameworks and goals. Research was conducted through the Education Resource Information

Center (ERIC) and Google Scholar, and eight references were located. A literature review was

performed to determine their relevance to the research. Results revealed a significant amount of

similarities and differences between two planning models, and how they may be used in future

research.

Compare and Contrast Program Planning Models

In preparation for meetings or projects, there are various program planning models that can be used to assist adults depending on the goals of the program. It has been known that these models have greatly helped adults as the outcomes have benefited from careful planning. As adults have gained a tremendous amount of education and experience, collaboration within a group can best be effective when these two factors are best used so that different perspectives can be realized to produce a more professional product. In order to do this, a planning program would need to be developed to ensure this. Two program planning models, from Tyler and Caffarella, were compared and contrasted to determine their similarities and differences presented by the author's perspectives.

Program Planning Models

As there are many examples of planning models, Tyler and Caffarella's models have been defined by various researchers. Caffarella (2010) defined program planning models as "ideas of one or more persons about how programs should be put together and what ingredients are necessary to ensure successful outcomes" (p. 15). Uhland's (1994) definition included the "process associated with designing, developing, and implementing orderly, purposeful learning experiences to meet new needs and expanding interests that grow out of an adult's changing role in his or her social setting" (p. 62). Caffarella and Daffron (n.d.) cited Sork's (2010) research on planning program's concept as conventional or traditional, where it is "a step-wise progression, where you move logically through the planning process" (p. 77). Research will demonstrate the comparison and contrast of information of two examples of program planning models, Tyler and Caffarella's models.

Comparing Tyler and Caffarella's Models

When examining the previously defined program planning models, Tyler and Caffarella's models share these characteristics. Daffron's (2011) presentation demonstrated that both models share ideas of how authors have developed successful models (Caffarella, 2010), what developmental plan process and adult roles involve in the process (Uhland, 1994), and that a planning program concept should be a step-wise progression (Caffarella & Daffron, n.d.). Caffarella (2002, as cited by Warren, n.d.) reported that most planning models share "the needs and ideas of learners, organizations, and/or communities as central to the program planning process; the importance of context in the planning process; and identifiable components and practical tasks that are important to the planning process" (p. 20). Caffarella and Daffron (n.d.) continue that practitioners of both models spend time gaining a clear understanding of the nature of the problems to be addressed. The majority of the time that is spent in planning these programs is spent building relationships with potential program participants which require new ways of thinking in the world, or modifying or abandoning plans. Planners bring their experiences to the table, stories gathered through conversations, emails with program planners, interactions among students in classes, observations of planners in action, and experiences in this arena (Caffarella & Daffron, n.d.). Though the two models have similarities, they also have differing characteristics.

Differentiating Both Models

Model Structure

Research has indicated that both models differ in their structural make up. Tyler's Model is linear in nature (Uhland, 1994) and was originally termed Linear Objective (Bell & Lefoe, 1998). This model is composed of four questions, in sequential order (Uhland, 1994).

Caffarella's Model is circular in nature where it "has no real beginnings or endings" (Caffarella, 2002, p. 21). This model consists of 12 steps presented in no particular order. Each step points to the center circle, the Interactive Model of Program Planning (Caffarella, 2001).

Philosophy

According to Sork (1997), Tyler proposed a systematic approach to meeting educational needs of learners while encouraging accountability through the use of outcome-oriented objectives and systematic evaluation. Caffarella (2002) suggested that, in Caffarella's model, planners need a globally integrated model that took into account multiple and often simultaneous responsibilities, last minute decisions and adjustments, and conflicting interests.

Framework

Uhland (1994) revealed that Tyler's 1949 model was originally a conceptual framework. Tyler refined his model in 1874 based on Gagne's 1965 theory concepts; learning was environmentally dependent and could be scientifically measured, altered, and controlled (Uhland, 1994). Caffarella's model provides beliefs as assumptions that coincide with Knowles' (1990) research. Caffarella's ethical decisions and conflicting values and beliefs follow that of Cervero and Wilson (1994).

<div align="center">

Conclusion

</div>

Research revealed that there were significant differences and similarities in both planning models. Tyler and Caffarella's models have an intention of setting a goal, producing a product depending on the goal of the program, and realize the time in reaching the goal. Both models differ in their model structure, philosophy, and framework. Even with these similarities and differences, both models are still able to produce challenging outcomes depending on the goal of the program.

References

Bell, M. & Lefoe, G. (1998, December). Curriculum design for flexible delivery – massaging

the model. *Research Online*. Retrieved from

http://ro.uow.edu.au/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1170&context=edupapers&sei-

redir=1&referer=http%3A%2F%2Fscholar.google.com%2Fscholar%3Fq%3Dbell%252C

%2Blefoe%252C%2Bcurriculum%2Bdesign%2Bfor%2Bflexible%2Bdelivery%26hl%3

Den%26as_sdt%3D1%252C10%26as_sdtp%3Don#search=%22bell%2C%20lefoe%2C

%20curriculum%20design%20flexible%20delivery%22

Caffarella, R. (2010). Planning programs for adults. *Designing and Assessing Learning

Experiences.* Jossey-Bass: San Francisco, CA.

Caffarella, R. (2001). An Interactive Model of Program Planning. *Planning Programs For Adult

Learners*.

Caffarella, R., & Daffron, S. (n.d.). Model building in planning programs: Blending theory and

practice. Retrieved from

http://www.adulterc.org/Proceedings/2011/papers/caffarella_daffron.pdf

Daffron, S. (2011). Program Planning Models [Review of the DVD *Designing and Assessing

Learning Experiences*, produced by Laureate Education Inc., 2011].

Sork, T. (1997). Workshop planning. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education. 76*. 5-

17

Uhland, R. (1994). Social policy and adult education program planning: Perspectives on the

Tyler and Boyle models. *PAACE Journal of Lifelong Learning. 3*. 62-70. Retrieved from

http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=uhland%2C%201994%2C%20social%20poli

cy&source=web&cd=2&sqi=2&ved=0CCcQFjAB&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.iup.edu

%2FWorkArea%2Flinkit.aspx%3FLinkIdentifier%3Did%26ItemID%3D18163&ei=l9C-

Toi0LMKhtweuo5njBg&usg=AFQjCNGZhcptSDvS4zWhkqq4Pd52ohHLzQ

Warren, R. (n.d.). Program planning and development in adult education: Where we are at the

beginning of the 21st century. Retrieved from

http://www.hiceducation.org/edu_proceedings/Ruth%20M.%20Warren.pdf